

REMARKS

Applicant has carefully reviewed and considered the Office Action mailed on October 27, 2003, and the references cited therewith.

Claim 1 is amended; as a result, claims 1-31 are now pending in this application.

Specification Objection

Applicant has amended the specification as required by the Examiner and therefore believes that the rejection with respect to page 29 line 10 is no longer appropriate and should be withdrawn

Drawing and Related Specification Objections

The drawings were objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because for example, in figure 6, reference characters “502” and “1102” have both been used to designate “transparent proxy”. The Examiner stated that “[t]his type of error is repeated many times throughout the application.” Applicant is required to carefully review the application to correct such errors.

Applicant has carefully reviewed the specification and the figures, including figure 6 as mentioned above by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully asserts that there are no amendments required for the specification or the figures, including figure 6, with respect to this objection. The dual reference numerals are appropriate in the figures because as used in the context of the specification the reference numeral 502 refers to a context in which a transparent proxy is being used with the invention. A transparent proxy is one in which the client is unaware of the existence of that proxy. Conversely, reference numeral 1102 is explained in context within the specification as being a proxy which is known to the client, *i.e.* not a transparent proxy.

The dual reference numerals supply alternate designations for a single box in the figures depending upon the context, which is adequately described and distinguished throughout the specification. Adding duplicate boxes to the figures is not needed and only further complicates the figures. The dual reference labels are adequately and clearly defined throughout the specification, such that reference numeral 502 is a transparent proxy and reference numeral 1102 is a known or non-transparent proxy. As one of many examples which demonstrates this

consistency and which explains the context properly, the Examiner's attention is directed to page 15 of the specification lines 14-15, where it is stated "[t]he system includes at least one *transparent proxy 502 or novel known proxy server 1102 . . .*" *Emphasis added.*

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that no amendments are needed to the figures or the drawings to overcome this objection, since the Applicant has now adequately explained how the specification properly uses the dual reference numerals within the proper context of the discussion. Thus, Applicant respectfully requests that these objections have been overcome and should be withdrawn.

§103 Rejection of the Claims

Claims 1-4, 6-7, 9-17, and 20-31 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Callaghan et al. (U.S. 2002/0007317) in view of Shrader et al. (U.S. 6,374,359). It is of course fundamental that in order to sustain an obviousness rejection each and every step or element of the rejected claims must be taught or suggested in the cited references.

With respect to Applicant's amended independent claim 1, Applicant's respectfully assert that neither Callaghan nor Shrader standing alone or in combination teach "receiving at a *transparent proxy* a request from a client[.]" as is recited in Applicant's amended independent claim 1. *Emphasis added.* There is no teaching or a suggestion of a teaching in Callaghan or in Shrader of a transparent proxy.

Moreover, one of ordinary skill in the art appreciates that the difference between a transparent proxy and a proxy known to the client is not insignificant. This is so, because a client needs to be configured to communicate with a known proxy but does not need to be configured with a transparent proxy, because a transparent proxy feigns its appearance and intercepts requests directed to or originating from the client.

The Examiner has assert with respect to the rejection of claim 14 that Shrader teaches a transparent proxy and as evidence of this teaching the Applicant was directed to the entire column 5 of the Shrader reference. Specifically, the Applicant was directed to the description of step 56 on lines 49-52 of column 5. Applicant has inspected column 5 and step 56 of the Shrader reference in detail, and respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's conclusion that this teaches or suggests a transparent proxy.

On the contrary, column 5 and step 56 clearly teaches a known proxy service and not a transparent proxy service. The Examiner's attention is directed to line 44 where the paragraph that discusses step 56 begins. Here, a user actually identifies and enters an LDAP Web server with an appropriate URL and enters a user name and password. This login is not intercepted by a transparent proxy and redirected to a transparent proxy when the user enters the URL for the LDAP Web server; the login occurs directly between the user and the LDAP Web server and there is no intermediary transparent proxy service that feigns its appearance intercepts the login information and submits it to the LDAP web server on behalf of the user. Thus, Applicant respectfully disagrees with the Examiner's conclusions, because the Applicant cannot find a single teaching or suggestion of a teaching in Shrader that would support a conclusion that it teaches a transparent proxy consistent with how a transparent proxy is understood and known in the art.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully request that the rejection with respect to Applicant's amended claim 1 be withdrawn, since there is no teaching or suggestion of a teaching in the cited references to support a transparent proxy as is recited in Applicant's amended claim 1.

With respect to Applicant's independent claim 14, Applicant has provided remarks above with respect to the rejection of Applicant's independent claim 1 which are directly applicable to and directly address the Examiner's rejection of claim 14. Thus, for the reasons stated above Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejection with respect to claim 14 should be withdrawn, because Shrader fails to teach or suggest a transparent proxy as is recited in Applicant's independent claim 14.

With respect to Applicants independent claim 23, the Examiner has directed the Applicant to see page 3 paragraphs 44-48 of the Callaghan reference in support of the conclusion that Callaghan (as opposed to Shrader) teaches a transparent proxy server as is recited in Applicant's independent claim 23. The Applicant has carefully inspected these paragraphs and cannot find a teaching or a suggestion of a teaching where a proxy server can be explicitly or implicitly said to have been disclosed.

The description presented in paragraphs 44-48 discusses a standard client, proxy, and server relationship, where the proxy is called an intermediary application in the Callaghan reference. However, no where in the description is a transparent proxy disclosed or suggested,

even though at paragraph 50 the Callaghan reference states that the server is not aware of the intermediary application there is still no suggestion or teaching that the client is unaware of the intermediary application, which is necessary to support the concept of a transparent proxy. In fact, the intermediary application of Callaghan is not a transparent proxy it is a traditional proxy that requires pre configuration with the client such that the client knows that it is interacting with the intermediary application.

Accordingly, Applicant respectfully asserts that Callaghan does not teach or suggest a transparent proxy as is recited in Applicant's independent claim 23. Therefore, Applicant respectfully requests that the rejection with respect to independent claim 23 be withdrawn.

With respect to Applicant's independent claim 27, The Examiner relies on the conclusions and rejections presented for the rejection of Applicant's independent claim 1. Correspondingly, for the same reasons stated above with respect to independent claim 1, Applicant respectfully asserts that the rejection with respect to Applicant's independent claim 27 is not appropriate and should be withdrawn.

Claim 5 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Callaghan et al. (U.S. 2002/0007317) in view of Shrader et al. (U.S. 6,374,359) and further in view of Birrell et al. (U.S. 5,805,803). Claim 5 is dependent from claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant incorporates by reference here the arguments presents above with respect to Applicant's claim 1 and respectfully asserts that since claim 5 is dependent from claim 1 that claim 5 is allowable and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Claim 8 was rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Callaghan et al. (U.S. 2002/0007317) in view of Shrader et al. (U.S. 6,374,359) and further in view of Abdelnur et al. (U.S. 6,212,640). Claim 8 is dependent from claim 1. Accordingly, Applicant incorporates by reference here the arguments presents above with respect to Applicant's claim 1 and respectfully asserts that since claim 8 is dependent from claim 1 that claim 8 is allowable and the rejection should be withdrawn

Claims 18-19 were rejected under 35 USC § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Callaghan et al. (U.S. 2002/0007317) in view of Shrader et al. (U.S. 6,374,359) and further in view of Makarios et al. (U.S. 6,401,125). Claims 18-19 are dependent from independent claim 14. Accordingly, Applicant incorporates by reference here the arguments presented above with

respect to Applicant's claims 1 and 14 and respectfully asserts that since claims 18 and 19 are dependent from claim 14 that claims 18 and 19 are allowable and the rejection should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

Applicant respectfully submits that the claims are in condition for allowance and notification to that effect is earnestly requested. The Examiner is invited to telephone Applicant's attorney at (513) 942-0224 to facilitate prosecution of this application.

If necessary, please charge any additional fees or credit overpayment to Deposit Account No. 19-0743

Respectfully submitted,

HASHEM MOHAMMAD EBRAHIMI

By his Representatives,

SCHWEGMAN, LUNDBERG, WOESSNER & KLUTH, P.A.
P.O. Box 2938
Minneapolis, MN 55402
(513) 942-0224

Date 1-27-04

By

Joseph P. Mehrle
Joseph P. Mehrle
Reg. No. 45,535

CERTIFICATE UNDER 37 CFR 1.8: The undersigned hereby certifies that this correspondence is being deposited with the United States Postal Service with sufficient postage as first class mail, in an envelope addressed to: Commissioner of Patents, P.O. Box 1450, Alexandria, VA 22313-1450, on this 27th day of January, 2004.

Amy Moriarty
Name

Amy Moriarty
Signature